



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/126,884	07/31/1998	MICHAEL C. BERTRAM	533/133	9408

26291 7590 11/04/2003

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P.  
595 SHREWSBURY AVE  
FIRST FLOOR  
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, BRIAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2661

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/126,884

Applicant(s)

BERTRAM ET AL.

Examiner

Brian D Nguyen

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the amendment filed 9/4/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-10 and 12-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-10 and 12-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slattery (6,246,701) in view of Gardner et al (6,327,275).

Regarding claim 1, Slattery discloses a method for processing a transport stream (TS1, TS2, TS3) comprising a plurality of time slots for transporting therein respective programs having a common time base indicated by periodically inserted time stamps comprising modifying packets associated with a desired time slot of a received transport stream to produce an output transport stream and transmitting the output transport stream, wherein the transmitted output transport stream includes respective modified programs having the common time base indicated by the periodically inserted time stamps provided by the received transport stream (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50 & 62-65; col. 6, lines 11-16; col. 9, lines 26-30; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; and col. 40, lines 28-30). Slattery does not specifically disclose the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream. However, Gardner discloses the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream (see col. 1, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 30-59; and col. 5, lines 5-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a matching time stamp of the received transport stream as taught by

Art Unit: 2661

Gardner in the system of Slattery with the motivation being to maintain the timing of the packets in the received transport stream.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 5-6, Slattery further discloses examining and replacing NULL packets/programs with replacement packets/programs by inserting the replacement packets/programs into an output transport stream (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; and col. 40, lines 28-30).

Regarding claims 7-10 and 26, Slattery discloses an apparatus for processing a received transport stream comprising N time slots for transporting therein N respective programs having a common time base indicated by periodically inserted time stamps comprising a transport clock source; N transport encoders; a multiplexer for receiving and modifying packets associated with a desired time slot of one or more transport encoded program streams. The multiplexer producing a processed transport stream, wherein the processed transport stream includes respective modified programs having the common time base indicated by the periodically inserted time stamps provided by the received transport stream and a file server coupled between the multiplexer and the N transport encoders (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 9, lines 26-30; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; col. 29, line 41-col. 30, line 7; and col. 40, lines 28-30). Slattery implicitly discloses a frequency divider to divide a timing signal CLK from the transport clock source into N timing signals so as the bit rate of the slotted transport stream will be equal to the sum of the bit rates of the N slots. Slattery does not specifically disclose the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream. However, Gardner discloses the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream (see col. 1, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 30-59; and col. 5, lines 5-13).

Art. Unit: 2661

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a matching time stamp of the received transport stream as taught by Gardner in the system of Slattery with the motivation being to maintain the timing of the packets in the received transport stream.

Regarding claim 12, Slattery discloses an apparatus for processing a received transport stream comprising a plurality of time slots for transporting therein a respective plurality of programs having a common time base indicated by periodically inserted time stamps comprising a transport clock source, a plurality of encoder for receiving and encoding program streams to produce a respective encoded program stream, each of the encoded program streams being coupled to a switch via a respective buffer memory, the switch selectively coupling program stream transport packets from the buffer memories for modifying packets associated with a desired time slot to produce a slotted transport stream, wherein the slotted transport stream includes respective modified programs having the common time base indicated by the periodically inserted time stamps provided by the received transport stream (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 9, lines 26-30; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; col. 29, line 41-col. 30, line 7; and col. 40, lines 28-30). Slattery implicitly discloses a frequency divider to divide a timing signal CLK from the transport clock source into N timing signals so as the bit rate of the slotted transport stream will be equal to the sum of the bit rates of the N slots. Slattery does not specifically disclose the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream. However, Gardner discloses the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream (see col. 1, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 30-59; and col. 5, lines 5-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

Art. Unit: 2661

art at the time the invention was made to a use a matching time stamp of the received transport stream as taught by Gardner in the system of Slattery with the motivation being to maintain the timing of the packets in the received transport stream.

Regarding claims 13, 16-17, and 21-22, Slattery further discloses a file server (40) for storing encoded program streams and selectively providing at least one encoded program stream to the switch (see Figure 1).

Regarding claims 14-15, 18-20, and 23-25, Slattery further discloses NULL transport packets, adding and deleting NULL transport packets and program packets (see elements 50 & 60 of Figure 1; col. 4, lines 62-67; col. 5, lines 48-50; and col. 10, lines 32-40).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 9/4/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that Slattery teaches that the time stamps are re-stamped for the output transport stream. That is, the time base associated with the time stamps of the output transport stream is different than the time base associated with the time stamps of the received transport stream. The argument is not persuasive because Slattery teaches the time base associated with the time stamps of the output transport stream can be either the same or different from the time base associated with the time stamps of the received transport stream. The time bases are different when the ordering of transport packet in a transport stream is re-arranged and the same when re-multiplexing involves the selective modification of the content of a transport stream, such as adding transport packets including null program to a TS or deleting transport

Art.Unit: 2661

packets from a TS (see col. 4, lines 62-67). Slattery maintains the time base by inserting null transport packet into the time slot to maintain the bit rate (see col. 5, lines 48-50 and col. 10, lines 32-40), in this case, the time stamps are not re-stamped for the output transport stream. Gardner clearly shows the order of transport packets by using the letters A, B, C for source A, B, and C. For example, the "B" packets are discarded and replaced with null program "- -" indicates no data (see col. 4, lines 30-48). By inserting null program in the transport stream, the order of the transport stream is maintained. Therefore, the time stamps are not re-stamped for the output transport stream. Both of the references teaches maintaining the common time base for the output transport stream but Gardner clearly express this limitation by using letters A, B, and C for packets from source A, B, and C.

### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art.Unit: 2661

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian D Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5133.

The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Olms can be reached on (703) 305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

BN  
10/22/03



DOUGLAS OLMS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600